REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the comments in the Office Action, which has been carefully considered. It is respectfully submitted that all issues raised are traversed, being hereinafter addressed with reference to the relevant headings appearing in the Detailed Action section of the Office Action.

The Applicant has amended the claim set. The Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments to the claim set are fully supported by the originally filed specification.

Claim 1 is currently amended and has been substantially revised due to the Examiner's rejections. It is submitted that claim 1 is fairly based on the application as filed and finds support throughout the description.

Claim 1 now recites "*a feed mechanism for feeding a card having an array of dots past the optical reader*", support is found by reference to page 17 in the section headed Artcard 9 and the subsequent section Linear Image Sensor 34, with reference to Fig. 1D and Fig. 2.

Claim 1 also now recites "*an optical reader interface that is connected to the optical reader, the optical reader interface able to control the optical reader to detect a data area on the card, to detect a bit pattern corresponding to the array of dots in the data area, and to produce raw data from the bit pattern while the card is being fed past the optical reader, the raw data used to produce an image processing script*", support is found by reference to page 55 in the section Artcard Interface 87 and on page 58 in the section Decoding and Artcard with reference to Fig. 37.

Claim 1 also now recites "*a processor that is connected to the optical reader interface to receive and apply the image processing script to the stored image to generate an output image with the desired effects*", with support found at page 111 under the heading Phase 5 Running the Vark Script.

Clarifying amendments have been made to dependent claims 2-7 due to the amendments to claim 1, and independent claim 8 has been amended similarly to claim 1.

It is noted that support for "*the array of dots defines a first resolution and the optical reader has a sensor with a second resolution at least twice the first resolution*" is found in the claims as originally filed.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112

Claims 1-8 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being allegedly indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention.

The applicant has amended the claim set to address the Examiner's rejection. It is respectfully submitted that the claims, and specifically claim 1, are now definite and clearly define the subject matter that the applicant regards as the invention.

The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

Claims 1-8 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by Koide *et al.* (US 6,870,566).

The applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 8 to more clearly distinguish the cited reference. It is submitted that Koide *et al.* does not teach or suggest all claim limitations of independent claims 1 or 8 and the rejection is therefore traversed.

Koide *et al.* is directed to an image sensing apparatus and system capable of sensing an image at the highest possible rate that a computer can receive image data from an image sensing unit without any loss of the data (Col 6, lines 4-8). Referring to Fig. 1, image sensing unit 11 includes CCD 102 that passes data via FIFO 105 and interface 109 to computer 12.

Koide *et al.* does not disclose, at least, any of the following features recited in the present claims:

> *A feed mechanism for feeding a card having an array of dots past the optical reader*
> *The optical reader interface able to control the optical reader to detect a data area on the card*
> *The optical reader interface to detect a bit pattern corresponding to the array of dots in the data area*
> *The optical reader interface to produce raw data from the bit pattern while the card is being fed past the optical reader*
> **The raw data used to produce an image processing script**
> *A processor ... to receive and apply the image processing script to the stored image to generate an output image with the desired effects*
> *The array of dots defines a first resolution and the optical reader has a sensor with a second resolution at least twice the first resolution.*

By way of example, the applicant highlights the feature of "*the raw data used to produce an image processing script*". This feature is nowhere suggested or taught in Koide *et al.* In the present invention, the image processing script (for example the VARK script in the description) is ultimately obtained from the arrangement of an array of dots on a card (for example the Artcard 9 in the description). This allows an image processing script to be obtained from a card that is inserted into image processing apparatus, for example a camera, so that desired visual effects can be applied to a stored image, for example a photograph taken by a camera.

Koide *et al.* does not disclose such a feature and is neither concerned with modifying a stored image to produce desired effects.

The Examiner's reconsideration of the ground of rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Applicant requests a Notice of Allowance of all the claims presently under examination.

Very respectfully,

Applicant/s:

_____
Kia Silverbrook

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
              393 Darling Street
              Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com

Telephone: +612 9818 6633

Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762